



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/002,990	01/05/1998	THEODORE D. WUGOFSKI	450.219US1	8453
32710	7590	08/12/2005	EXAMINER	
Stites & Harbison PLLC TransPotomac Plaza 1199 North Fairfax Street, Suite 900 Alexandria, VA 22314-1437			SALCE, JASON P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/002,990

Applicant(s)

WUGOFSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Jason P. Salce

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 28-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 28-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/18/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Williams does not teach the limitation "transmitting said modified media signals to said presentation device". The examiner agrees with the Applicant, however, Morrison is used to teach this limitation in the 103 combination of Williams and Morrison. As stated in the previous Office Action, Morrison discloses that circuits 155 and 135 adjust the video and audio settings before displaying on the presentation device (television 158 or speakers 136), thereby creating a modified signal and transmitting the modified signal to a presentation device. The other teachings of Morrison (which are continually noted by Applicant) are not addressed by the examiner in the rejection of claim 10, therefore, the examiner stresses that the claims limitations should be the primary focus, and how Williams and Morrison read on those claim limitations.

Applicant also argues that it would not be obvious to combine the inventions of Williams and Morrison, and that "these teachings of Morrison have nothing to do with the teachings of the Williams patent". The examiner disagrees and notes that Williams teaches a system (Figure 1) from a plurality of sources and according to the database 700 (Figure 7) controls such functions as the volume level. Morrison discloses a similar system that is connected to a plurality of sources at video switch 137 and instead of adjust the volume level at the presentation device 136, Morrison discloses modifying the

Art Unit: 2614

signal at processor 135. The examiner stresses that both system automatically adjust a viewer's settings from a plurality of sources, therefore, the teachings of Williams clearly are related to the teachings of Morrison.

Applicant also argues that, "the Morrison reference clearly has nothing to do with, "associating each of a plurality of setting values for a presentation device with each of a plurality of media input signals in a multimedia system". Again, see the previous Office Action for Williams teachings these limitations.

In regards to the remaining arguments, the examiner has provided new grounds of rejection for all claims stating to have a switch.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 28-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 10-22 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,945,988) in view of Morrison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,502).

Referring to claim 10, Williams discloses associating each of a plurality of setting values for a presentation device (see database 700 in Figure 7, which associates a

Art Unit: 2614

volume and channel setting with a television (presentation device)) with each of a plurality of media input devices having media input signals in a multimedia system (see settings for a computer and audio components in Figure 7, also note that a plurality of media input devices are also disclosed by elements 110, 112, 106 and 114 in Figure 1).

Williams also discloses selecting one of said media input signals for presentation to a user of said system (see Column 3, Lines 58-63 for a remote control communicating with the components of the system).

Williams also discloses modifying said one media input signal in accordance with one of said setting values, wherein said one setting value is associated with said one media input signal (see Column 7, Lines 65-67 and Column 8, Lines 1-2).

Williams also discloses presenting said one media input signal to said user with the presentation device having the value of said setting associated with a corresponding media input device (see Column 5, Lines 39-62 for an example of presenting a channel (media input signal) to the user's television (presentation device) having a value stored in a user's profile stored in a database (see Figure 7), which relates settings to an input device).

Although Williams discloses modifying the signal according to the settings stored in database 700, Williams only discloses sending control signals to manually adjust the television and fails to specifically disclose that the modified signal is transmitted to the presentation device. Morrison discloses a television receiver that receives an RF input and external video and audio input (see elements 100 and VIDEO IN and AUDIO IN (Figure 3)), which transmits the video signal to a switch, which transmits either RF or

external video output to a presentation device 158 in Figure 3. Also note that Morrison discloses a database similar to Williams database 700 in Figure 2, and that this database dictates what settings will be adjusted by circuits 155 and 135 in Figure 3, and then transmitted to the presentation device 158.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the multimedia signal system of Williams, using the television receiver, as taught by Morrison, for the purpose of updating receiver characteristics such as audio and video settings without viewer involvement (see Column 2, Lines 15-17 of Morrison).

Referring to claim 11, Williams discloses a plurality of settings with each of said media input signals (in addition to “moderate volume” settings for the television/monitor 102 can include “sports-type programming”, “no blocking”, and “no supplemental programming requested” disclosed at Column 5, Lines 51-53).

Referring to claim 12, Williams discloses a data structure for holding said values for all of said settings (see user profile database 700 in Figure 7), and said structure having a separate entry for each of said media input signals (note that each column of the user profile database 700 in Figure 7 represents a different media input signal (television, computer, or audio components)).

Referring to claim 13, Williams discloses receiving a modification command from said user (see Column 7, Lines 52-57). Williams also discloses modifying the value of said setting for only said one media signal (see updating “appropriate” records of the user profile at Column 7, Lines 57-62).

Referring to claim 14, see rejection of claim 10.

Referring to claim 15, Williams discloses wherein each of said parameter entries holds multiple values ("CH", "VOL", "GENRE", etc. in Figure 7) each corresponding to a different presentation of media from said signals (different volume settings, and different television channels shown in Figure 7).

Referring to claim 16, Williams discloses that a first group of parameter entries ("TELEVISION") controls the presentation of media from a first output device (television/monitor 102, see default settings at Column 7, Lines 3-9), and a second group of said parameter entries ("AUDIO COMPONENTS") controls the presentation of media from a second output device (audio/video tuner and amplifier 110, see Column 7, Lines 9-11). The examiner notes that these citations disclose that the television/monitor 102 is linked to the "TELEVISION" parameter entries in the user profile database, and the audio/video tuner and amplifier 110 is linked to the "AUDIO COMPONENT" parameter entries.

Referring to claim 17, Williams discloses receiving a selection code from said user representing said one signal (see Column 3, Lines 60-63 for system components and wireless communication transmitter for communicating with the system components at Column 4, Lines 11-19).

Morrison discloses switching said one input signal to said one output device (see element 137 in Figure 3 for switching between two different input signals). See the rejection of claim 40 for the proper motivation for using Morrison's video switch 137 in Figure 3.

Referring to claim 18, Williams discloses receiving a parameter code for modifying the value of said parameter for only a particular one of said input signals (see Column 7, Lines 57-60 for providing user inputs to the system). The user input is the "parameter code".

Williams also discloses a modified value of said parameter in response to said code (see logging the user inputs at Column 7, Lines 57-60). The logging of inputs is the "modified value".

Williams also discloses storing said modified parameter value in an entry of said table corresponding to said particular one input signal (see updating user preference information found in appropriate records of the user profile at Column 7, Lines 61-62).

Williams also discloses presenting media from said selected signal to said output device in accordance with said modified parameter value (see display device 518 being a television at Column 12, Lines 30-31). It is inherent that the television will display the updated data in the user profile 700, for example if a change in the volume setting is selected, the next time the user views the particular, the volume might change from moderate to low, based on the users previous configuration (see again Column 7, Lines 52-62 for updating the user profile 700).

Referring to claim 19, Williams discloses that the said particular one signal is one of said signals currently selected in response to the said selection command (see Joe User viewing either channel 2 or 7 at Column 5, Lines 49-55).

Referring to claim 20, see rejection of claim 13.

Referring to claim 21, Williams discloses each of said table entries holds multiple values (different volumes) each corresponding to a different one of a plurality of parameters ("CH" or "VOL") associated with the presentation of media from said signals ("TELEVISION" or "COMPUTER"). See Figure 7.

Referring to claim 22, Williams discloses wherein said parameter code further specifies a particular one of said parameters as said parameter to be modified (see Column 3, Line 64 to show that the wireless I/O device is a wireless keyboard). A keyboard has multiple keys; therefore it is inherent that a keyboard can send a particular parameter depending on which key is pressed. For example, remote controls that are well known in the art have a channel up or down key, or a volume up or down key.

Referring to claim 45, see the rejection of claim 18.

4. Claims 28-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,945,988) in view of Lepley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,389,963).

Referring to claim 28, see rejection of claim 40 (below).

Referring to claim 29, Williams discloses that the user input device is a keyboard having a number of buttons for producing said selection command (see wireless keyboard at Column 3, Line 64). It is inherent that a keyboard has more than one button.

Referring to claim 30, Williams discloses a data processor coupled to the output device for presenting signals to be presented thereon (see element 104 in Figure 1), and wherein said keyboard also includes an array of data-entry keys for the data processor (see wireless keyboard at Column 3, Line 64). Note that a keyboard sends commands to the data processor (see Column 4, Lines 17-19).

Referring to claim 31, Williams discloses that the input device is further adapted to produce a parameter modification command (user inputs at Column 7, Lines 54-55), and wherein said table is adapted to store a modified value of said parameter (logs each input at Column 7, Lines 54-55) in one of said table entries so as to affect the value of said parameter only for one of said media signals associated with said one table entry (see updating the user preference information found in the appropriate records of the user profile (Column 7, Lines 61-62).

Referring to claim 32, Williams discloses that the input device has a number of buttons for producing said parameter modification command (see rejection of claim 29).

Referring to claim 33, Williams discloses that the input device contains a wireless link such that said parameter modification command can be performed by said user from a position from which said output device is normally viewed (see rejection of claim 29, which also shows wireless link).

Referring to claim 34, Williams discloses that the parameter of said output signal is audio volume (see Column 7, Line 59).

Referring to claim 35, Williams discloses that the parameter of said output signal is color (see Column 7, Line 59).

Referring to claim 36, Williams discloses an output device (see element 518 in Figure 5).

Referring to claim 37, Williams discloses that the output device is a video monitor (see Column 5, Line 43).

Referring to claim 38, Williams discloses that the output device can be a sound system (see Column 5, Line 42).

Referring to claim 39, Williams discloses a DVD player (see Column 3, Line 42).

Referring to claim 40, Williams discloses a plurality of media devices, each providing a different media signal so that said media devices provide media signals (see devices 110, 112, 114 and 106 in Figure 1).

Williams also discloses a presentation device having parameters for controlling the presentation of said media signals received from the media devices (see element 102 in Figure 1 for presenting a media signal and Figure 7 for a database 700 that has parameters (user profiles) that controls the media signals (from a television or computer) received from media devices (see devices 110, 112, 114 and 106 in Figure 1)).

Williams also discloses an input device, for responsive to said user for selecting (through a selection command) one said media device and one said media signal from the one media device (see Column 3, Lines 60-63 for a user input device communicating with media devices and Column 7, Lines 20-33 for selecting a channel

from the grid, where only channels from preferred media devices are presented, therefore the user is selecting a media signal from a specific media device).

Williams also discloses a table having a plurality of entries each holding values of the parameters for the presentation device based on the media device providing the media signal (see database 700 for holding a plurality of entries (volume, genre, etc.) each holding values (o, +, -, etc.) of the parameters of the presentation device (what the value will be for TV 102 in Figure 1 (o, +, -)) based on the media device providing the signal (television, computer or audio component)).

Williams also discloses a processor responsive to said selection command for accessing said values from said table (see element 104 in Figure 1 and Column 5, Lines -67 and Column 6, Lines 1-7), said values being in an entry corresponding to the media device providing the selected media signal (see again volume setting for a television and the different setting for multiple media devices in database 700 in Figure 7).

Williams also discloses an output controller (element 104 in Figure 1) coupled to said output device (see element 106 in Figure 1) for applying values to the presentation device (the monitor 102) such that the media signal is presented in accordance with the parameters (see again Column 4, Lines 5-19 for controlling a VCR 106 (output device) coupled to system controller 104 (output controller) through a system bus 108, which outputs video signals to a television monitor 102).

Williams discloses a bus for routing signals to the monitor 102 (presentation device) (see bus 108 in Figure 1 and Column 4, Lines 8-15 for routing media signals

from the media devices (see devices 110, 112, 114 and 106 in Figure 1) to the presentation device (TV 102 in Figure 1)), but fails to teach a switch for transferring input signals to a presentation device.

Lepley discloses a switch 300 in Figure 1, which transmits an input signal selected from said plurality of said media signals from said plurality of different media devices to said output device in response to said selection command (see Column 5, Lines 17-29).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the bus, as taught by Williams, using the switch, as taught by Lepley, for the purpose of allowing a system that has multiple media sources to transmit requested audio/video signals from the sources to multiple rooms and allowing the use of a single switch for both audio and video signals, which reduces the cost and the interconnections (see Column 9, Lines 1-7 of Lepley).

Referring to claims 41 and 42, see rejection of claim 40.

Referring to claim 43, see the rejection of claim 40.

Referring to claim 44, see the rejection of claims 30 and 40.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2614

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason P. Salce whose telephone number is (571) 272-7301. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason P Salce
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2614

August 8, 2005



CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600